

Date: Sat, 5 Nov 94 04:30:18 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: List  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #520  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 5 Nov 94 Volume 94 : Issue 520

## Today's Topics:

10 WPM Generals? (2 msgs)  
NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULlets (4 msgs)  
Open Letter to Jeff Herman was Re: Deleting Richard Cris

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 4 Nov 1994 17:05:56 GMT  
From: lakeith@robins.af.mil ( Larry CONTRACTOR Keith Mr.)  
Subject: 10 WPM Generals?

Cecil\_A\_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com wrote:  
: Quote from Sept 94 Radio Fun

: "Slow-code" is the name given to an Amateur Radio Industry Association  
: proposal to lower the General Class code speed requirement to 10 words  
: per minute. So far, it has gained far more support than criticism in  
: ham radio circles... An unofficial poll being conducted by Newsline is  
: so far five-to-one in favor... from TNX Westlink Report, No. 673

: EndQuote;

: If 62% of hams don't use CW, it would logically follow that the  
: overwhelming majority of all hams would favor lowering the CW testing  
: requirement. I've often wondered why the ARRL didn't include me in  
: their poll.

When did the ARRL conduct a poll on this question?

73,

Larry, KQ4BY

---

Date: 4 Nov 1994 19:46:23 GMT  
From: mjsilva@ix.netcom.com (michael silva)  
Subject: 10 WPM Generals?

In <39c9hq\$10v@chnews.intel.com> Cecil\_A\_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com writes:

>If 62% of hams don't use CW, it would logically follow that the  
>overwhelming majority of all hams would favor lowering the CW testing  
>requirement. I've often wondered why the ARRL didn't include me in  
>their poll.

>--

Fine, let's lower it to 10, or even 5wpm. BUT, at the same time let's  
increase the difficulty of the writtens! Don't just make getting a  
ticket easier (yet again...), redirect the hours saved in getting to 13  
to whatever is considered more appropriate knowledge for today's ham.

Now, let's all hold our breath waiting for a tougher written....

Mike, KK6GM

---

Date: 2 Nov 1994 19:38:38 GMT  
From: little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little)  
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULletins

In article <1994Nov2.032455.26815@news.csuohio.edu>, sww@csuohio.edu (Steve Wolf)

writes:

|>Hank Oredson (hanko@wv.mentorg.com) wrote:  
|>: Nope, because AX.25, by it's very nature, is not used for one-  
|>: way communications. Oh yes, you might say, it COULD be  
|>: (there are UI frames!), but it's not.  
|>:  
|>  
|>But is is broadcasting none the less.  
|>  
|>I think it was Todd Little that that quoted the definition of broadcasting.  
|>  
|>From Part 97.3(a) ... (10) ... Broadcasting - Transmissions intended for  
|>reception by the general public, either direct or relayed.

|>  
|>Clearly, a BBS phone port with a anonymous check-in allows the public access  
|>to relayed transmissions. There are LOTS of phone ports that allow  
|>anonymous check-ins.  
|>  
|>So, originators of bulletins which are sent by any means to a BBS that has  
|>a public phone port that are not about amateur radio would fall under  
|>broadcasting.

Good grief man, did you read what you posted? Because some station some where along the message forwarding system allows the public access to the messages certainly doesn't make it broadcasting by the above definition. The originator had no idea that the message forwarding station would allow some land line user in. So he clearly couldn't have intended the general public to receive it. That is tantamount to saying that all phone transmissions are broadcasting because some non-ham somewhere in the world has a short wave radio. NOT! The message is simply third party traffic as defined and allowed in Part 97.

Please \*READ\* the regulations.

|>Broadcasting does not require a one-way transmission. It would appear that  
|>an ax.25 connection between two stations can still be used for broadcasting.

It can \*NOT\*! The general public can not engage in the necessary two-way communication as they aren't licensed to do so. Stop trying to confuse message forwarding systems with broadcasting. They are clearly defined in Part 97.

Again, read the regulations instead of using your own perverted definitions.

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

---

Date: 4 Nov 1994 18:08:02 GMT  
From: hanko@wv.mentorg.com (Hank Oredson)  
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETINS

In article <1994Nov3.115023.22992@news.csuohio.edu>, sww@csuohio.edu (Steve Wolf) writes:

|> Dave Horsfall (dave@eram.esi.com.au) wrote:  
|> : In article <1994Oct29.000208.29686@news.csuohio.edu>,  
|> : sww@csuohio.edu (Steve Wolf) writes:  
|> :  
|> : | All bulletins are broadcasting. They are sent in many directions. When be

|> : | forwarded, the receiving station did not ask for them. The sending station  
|> : | has no expectation that the receiving BBS will read or reply to them.  
|> :  
|> : Dunno about your neck of the woods, mate, but here down under the sender  
|> : presents a brief list of bulletins, and the receiver is invited to  
|> : accept or reject them...  
|>  
|> When being forwarded? Really? How does that work? I can understand the  
|> user being queried but as the quote says, we are talking about forwarding.

Oh, it works quite well, actually!

The receiver may reject a message presented during forwarding for any reason whatsoever.

This is how the system has worked for the past half-dozen years.

(Jeff, WA7MBL first implemented it in about 1986, and all the current BBS codes now use his method)

Steve, have you ever actually OPERATED packet and watched what the systems are doing? Might be a good idea to spend a few hours on air to see how it all works.

... Hank

— —

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics Library Operations  
Internet : hank\_oredson@mentorg.com "Parts 'R Us!"  
Amateur Radio: W0RLI@W0RLI.OR.USA.NOAM

Date: Sat, 5 Nov 1994 07:21:10 GMT  
From: [sww@csuohio.edu](mailto:sww@csuohio.edu) (Steve Wolf)  
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLeTins

2

: Steve, have you ever actually OPERATED packet and watched  
: what the systems are doing? Might be a good idea to spend  
: a few hours on air to see how it all works.

•

Aw, there you go getting grumpy again.

Like I told F6FNB, lot of people are doing the same thing you are, don't pat

a hole in your back over your 100k messages a year. We all have those same political agenda, recipes, sewing lessons, Rush Limbaugh, and other informational bulletins (that are beginning to consume the majority of the amateur radio network).

Your arguements are too far tangent and no longer of relevance.

73,  
Steve

Internet : no8m@hamnet.wariat.org  
Amateur Radio : no8m@no8m.#neoh.oh.usa.na  
MSYS Mail List: msys-request@hamnet.wariat.org ('info' for title)

---

Date: Mon, 31 Oct 1994 22:49:08 GMT  
From: sww@csuohio.edu (Steve Wolf)  
Subject: NoCal OO goes after Packet BULletins

Hank Oredson (hanko@wv.mentor.org) wrote:

:  
: Steve,  
:  
: sorry, but you are just plain wrong here.  
:  
: Please think about how things work, read part 97, and then  
: come back and join in the discussion with some useful ideas.  
:  
: This horse is dead, you can stop beating it.  
:  
: ... Hank

Is this supposed to be a form of arguement?

Ah! I was just plain wrong! No wonder!

73,  
Steve

---

Date: Thu, 3 Nov 1994 06:20:33 GMT  
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)  
Subject: Open Letter to Jeff Herman was Re: Deleting Richard Cris

In article <crispCynA24.15s@netcom.com> crisp@netcom.com (Richard Crisp) writes:

>It is intersting (sic) that I received a telephone call from another

>person about two days before Paul's post. The caller, whose name

Ah yes, in politics that's called ``The Old Boys' Network'' - interesting that it's found its way into the internet!

I'm seeing your article on rec.radio.amateur.policy - why are you cross posting non-radio articles to here now? Are you interested in getting licensed? If so, the exams are so simple now even you can pass them. Email me for details.

Jeff NH6IL

---

Date: Thu, 3 Nov 94 15:41:33 -0500  
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>

References<1994Nov2.032455.26815@news.csuohio.edu> <hY9W7A+edellers@delphi.com>,<CynLzH.JEx@wang.com>  
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULletins

Dave Bushong <dbushong@wang.com> writes:

>Look, folks. Anybody can read anything into anything, but we all know  
>what the \*intent\* of the rules are. Back in 1934 I found this on the  
>back of an envelope that one of the first Commissioners was doodling  
>on when they came up with the rules that are now Part 97:

Bingo. The intent of the rule is to prevent some guy who wants to be the next Boake Carter (or Alan Freed, or Cousin Brucie, or Rush Limbaugh) from using the amateur bands to broadcast to the general public, thereby choking the spectrum. To do this the rules specify that one-way transmissions of a character resembling broadcasting may only be made for certain defined purposes, limiting their coverage (mostly) to topics of interest to other amateurs. (I say "of a character resembling broadcasting" because other types of one-way transmissions are permitted that do not resemble broadcasting.)

My contention is that packet bulletins do not fall into the category of "broadcasting" because the mode being used makes it difficult for the bulletins to be accessed, over the public airwaves, by persons other than licensed amateurs.

--  
Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

---

Date: 4 Nov 1994 17:57:49 GMT

From: billsohl@earth.planet.net (Bill Sohl Budd Lake)

References<CyLzxK.E10@news.cv.nrao.edu> <396053\$6ku@agate.berkeley.edu>, <hY9XjS9.edellers@delphi.com>

Subject: Re: Type Acceptance - What is the logic behind it?

Ed Ellers (edellers@delphi.com) wrote:

: Ken A. Nishimura <kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU> writes:

:

: >No. Nothing says that you can't operate a fire dept. radio in the ham  
: >bands. If you can get the radio tech at the FD to reprogram your FD  
: >radio to operate on the ARES rept frequency, you're all set. It IS  
: >ILLEGAL to use your 2m HT on FD frequencies for the reasons above.

:

: That can't be emphasized too strongly -- the programming must be done by  
: someone with a commercial ticket, or else the radio can no longer be used in  
: the public safety services (or anywhere else but the amateur bands) until it  
: has been checked out by a licensed technician to ensure compliance.

I'm not sure that is 100% the case these days. I was chatting with someone employed in the service arena and he said (about 2 or more years ago) that the FCC no longer required technicians to have the commercial license. Now it may be that as employees of a service, that perhaps the FCC still requires one license to cover the business, but I don't really know if that's the case.

Anyone that can shed more current light on this would be welcome.

--  
Bill Sohl K2UNK (billsohl@planet.net)  
Budd Lake, New Jersey

-----  
Date: 4 Nov 1994 16:38:29 GMT

From: kaufman@Xenon.Stanford.EDU (Marc T. Kaufman)

References<CyLzxK.E10@news.cv.nrao.edu> <396053\$6ku@agate.berkeley.edu>, <hY9XjS9.edellers@delphi.com>

Subject: Re: Type Acceptance - What is the logic behind it?

In article <hY9XjS9.edellers@delphi.com>,

Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> wrote:

>Ken A. Nishimura <kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU> writes:

->No. Nothing says that you can't operate a fire dept. radio in the ham  
->bands. If you can get the radio tech at the FD to reprogram your FD  
->radio to operate on the ARES rept frequency, you're all set. It IS

->ILLEGAL to use your 2m HT on FD frequencies for the reasons above.

>That can't be emphasized too strongly -- the programming must be done by  
>someone with a commercial ticket, or else the radio can no longer be used in  
>the public safety services (or anywhere else but the amateur bands) until it  
>has been checked out by a licensed technician to ensure compliance.

Where did you get that notion? As long as you don't try to retune the RF circuits, anyone with access to a programmer can do the reprogramming.

Date: Wed, 2 Nov 1994 20:07:58 GMT  
From: dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong)

References<1994Oct25.145652.1856@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> <395ur8\$uic@snoopy.jh.org>, <398h09\$oh0@nntp.d1kg.dec.com>  
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLeTins

little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little) writes:

>Not so. No where in Part 97 is the notion of "intent" for the content  
>of a message covered.

It would have been good if you had read the rules before making such a statement:

### 97.3 Definitions.

(10) Broadcasting. Transmissions intended for reception by  
the general public, either direct or relayed.

### 97.113 Prohibited transmissions.

So you're wrong about that.... let's see what else you said:

>Wrong. The limitation on content needing to be related to amateur radio  
>is only for information bulletins which are an allowed form of one-way

>communication.

BZZZZT. Strike two (I think - I'm not really sure what that sentence tries to say, but if you are saying that the only one-way transmissions allowed are information bulletins, then I stand by my BZZZZT):

97.111 Authorized transmissions.

(b) In addition to one-way transmissions specifically authorized elsewhere in this Part, an amateur station may transmit the following types of one-way communications:

- (1) Brief transmissions necessary to make adjustments to the station;
- (2) Brief transmissions necessary to establishing two-way communications with other stations;
- (3) Transmissions necessary to remotely control a device from a distant location;
- (4) Transmissions necessary to providing emergency communications;
- (5) Transmissions necessary to assisting persons learning, or improving proficiency in, the international Morse code; and
- (6) Transmissions necessary to disseminate information bulletins.

>Let's use your Cookie Eaters Net on 40m as an example. If I'm checked in >and state that "There is a cookie tasting contest at Mrs. Fields this >weekend". It is simply a statement I make to the members of the net. I'm >not expecting a reply, but that doesn't make it "one-way". I addressed it >to no specific station, but instead it was loosely directed to all the >stations on the net, but that doesn't make it broadcasting. A packet message >sent to COOKIE@ALLUSA making the same statement is the same thing. It just >doesn't occur in real time.

Wrong again. You say "to no specific station" and then you say "directed to all the stations on the net" in the same breath. It can't be both. Then you say a packet message is the same thing, except that it's different. Wrong again - it can't be both.

>Every transmission does not need an explicit reply or acknowledgement to >be considered "two-way". No where in part 97 is that requirement made.

Fast and loose with Part 97 again. Part 97 differentiates between "one-way" and "two-way". If it's not one, then it's the other. That is, one of the "ways" is transmitting, the other "way" is receiving. It just differentiates between "broadcasting" and "conversing". A "one-way" transmission is when you are sending a message (and not expecting to engage into a conversation, I would suppose).

>Another example is if I give the local weather conditions to another ham.

>He probably didn't ask for it, he probably will come back with a  
>description of his station, so he didn't "acknowledge" it. So in your  
>definition that is illegal because it wasn't requested, wasn't acknowledged,  
>and it isn't amateur radio related? Puhleeze.....

You just went over the edge.

Two people having an interactive conversation about the weather, about their hamshacks, is what ham radio is all about. A thousand computers forwarding cookie recipes to ALL@USBBS is not what ham radio is about. You know it, I know it, and this discussion has become astoundingly boring and tedious, so while it may sadden a great many forward-thinkers, I'm going to terminate my participation in it.

73,  
Dave, KZ10

--  
Dave Bushong  
OPEN/image Recognition Products

---

Date: Fri, 4 Nov 1994 12:42:23 -0500  
From: roh033.mah48d@rohmhaas.com (John E. Taylor III)

References<Cy8u0z.6HJ@news.Hawaii.Edu> <38jrgg\$60a@abyss.West.Sun.COM>,  
<CyB5vA.9w8@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
Subject: Re: Questions on this and that

In article <CyB5vA.9w8@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) wrote:

> Here's a cute anecdote provided by Chuck K5FO: During the late 50's,  
> the phrase 'Shave and a haircut - two bits' became popular on  
> either the broadcast AM radio or TV (might have been a commercial).  
> Hams started using the first part (. . . .) in place of CQ on  
> HF. Another station hearing the pseudo-CQ would answer with the  
> ``two bits'' part: . . . and the QSO would then take off. This  
> got very popular with US hams but the FCC took a dim view of it  
> and started handing out lots of pink slips. The dit dit is still  
> retained on HF today - you'll hear a CW op end a QSO with that.

Ah, children...the dit dididit dit, dit dit phrase has been popular for \_far\_ longer than that; it was long in the tooth back when I was a whippersnapper in the '40s. ;-) (When dinosaurs roamed the earth and there was no broadcast TV.)

I've never heard it used among hams as an \_initial\_ call, but it's been popular as a sign-off. I've had people do the "dit dididit dit" thing, wait for me to respond with the appropriate "dit dit", and when I didn't, repeat it until I did! I finally shortened the whole thing to a single, laconic "dit." CW ops seem to know what that means. :-)

>

> Why would the FCC not like the . . . . / . . . exchange in  
> place of CQ and the proper response? Only recognized prosigns  
> are to be used on CW. Thus, I wouldn't test the FCC regarding  
> sending an A or N or T in place of 1 or 6 or 0, respectively,  
> with regard to a callsign exchange.

Yeah, within the conversation they don't really care, but callsigns are supposed to be in "standard" International Morse. I would not be surprised at an OO sending you a nice letter pointing out that cut numbers in a callsign are a no-no.

--

John Taylor (W3ZID) | "The opinions expressed are those of the  
roh033.mah48d@rohmhaas.com | writer and not of Rohm and Haas Company."

-----

Date: Mon, 31 Oct 1994 22:11:21 GMT  
From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

References<CCG8H1.IGJ@news.Hawaii.Edu> <CyIHLE.E0C@zeno.fit.edu>,  
<1994Oct31.190339.15079@arrl.org>

Reply-To: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

Subject: Re: I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah

In article <1994Oct31.190339.15079@arrl.org> ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare (KA1CV))  
writes:

>

>Well, I have heard problems on CW; my favorite frequency always seems to be  
>the national tune-up frequency. Although I think these problems are less on  
>CW than they are on phone, it is my conjecture that this is probably due to  
>two reasons: some of the phone problems are from non-hams who can't really do  
>any other kind of operating (they probably wouldn't know CW), and, more  
>likely, it is too much work to get on CW and swear for hours on end. :-)

Ain't it the truth. :-) Cussing on CW just doesn't have the flavor of  
cussing on voice. When it takes a minute to deliver one good curse,  
the impact is lost (though I've heard a \*long\* dash used as a cuss  
word). That's an advantage for keeping decorum on CW, but that same  
slowness plagues you when trying to get useful information transferred  
too.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

---

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #520

\*\*\*\*\*